UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,109	12/07/1999	DARRYL E. RUBIN	03797.81487	7310

28319	7590	06/03/2005

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET , N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06/25/2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-18 and 21</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-18 and 21</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/13/04, 5/26/04, 6/25/04, 7/19/04,

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 06/25/2004 to the original

application filed 12/07/1999; IDS filed 05/13/2004, 05/26/2004, 06/25/2004, 07/19/2004,

09/15/2004, 01/14/2005, and 02/11/2005.

2.   Claims 2-18 and 21 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 19-20 have

been canceled. Claims 2-7, 17-18, and 21 have been amended. Claims 2-5 and 21 are

independent claims.

Specification

3.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the limit of 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b),by another filed in the
United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2)a patent granted on an application for patent by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international
application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a)shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an
application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was
published under Article 21(2)of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claim 2-5, 9-18, and 21are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Smith, III (U.S. 6,772,139 – filed 10/1999).

As to independent claim 21:

Smith teaches a computer interface comprising:

(i)   a plurality of document pages *(e.g., documents; col.3, lines 46-49 and Fig.1)* ; and

(ii)   at least two of the document pages including links *(e.g., hypertext links in documents; col.3, lines 41-43)*, one of the links having a property that indicates a display format for the link *(e.g., control of link display based on link properties; col.3, lines 36-39 / Link properties can be specified ... control what is displayed; col.4, lines 9-20)*, wherein the links relates a spot in a document page with an executable object *(e.g., clicking the mouse on the underlined text, the visitor 'navigates' to the Web page shown in Fig.2 which provides an overview on the online service provided by the W3K; col.5, lines 27-34)*.

As to independent claim 2:

The rejection of claim 21 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Smith further teaches the display format of the link is based upon an examination of the content of a target document associated with the link *(e.g., links properties can be specified by users to control the automatic installation of link, and/or control what is displayed while browsing the link databases; col.4, lines 17-20 / displaying links selectively according various link properties, browsing provides a means for viewing useful link subsets, such as all links entered by the user or user's group; col.9, lines 1-12)*.

As to independent claim 3:

The rejection of claim 21 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Smith further

teaches the links has a property indicating the display update latency of the links *(e.g.,*

Link properties could be updated or added; col.27, lines 32-42).

As to independent claim 4:

a.   Smith teaches a computer readable medium having computer-executable

instructions for performing the steps of:

     (i)   in response to activation of a first link by user, navigating to a document

         page and display the document page in a first display format *(e.g., By*

         clicking on the hypertext link with the mouse, the user directs the browser

         program to 'follow the link' by 'navigating' to the URL associated with

         the link; col.3, lines 15-27);

     (ii)   in response to activation of a second link by user, the second link being

         different than the first link and linking the same document page linked to

         by the first link *(e.g., The link-target URL may point to another Web page*

         anywhere on the World Wide Web or it may simply point to another

         location within the same electronic document; col.3, lines 18-27),

         navigating to the link-to document page and display the document page in

         a second display format, the second display format being different than the

         first display format *(e.g., Link properties can be specified by users to*

         control the automatic installation of link, and/or to control what is

         displayed while browsing the link database; col.4, lines 9-20); and

(iii)   the first display format depending upon at least one property of the first

link; and the second link display format depending on at least one property

of the second link *(e.g., links are specified by properties, so links with*

different properties are used to retrieve and display documents in different

format; col.4, lines 9-20).

As to independent claim 5:

Smith teaches a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for

performing the steps of:

(i)   providing a plurality of user interface document pages *(e.g., HTML documents)* to

a user *(e.g., the user)*, at least one of the user interface document pages having at

least a first link *(e.g., hypertext links) (col.3, lines 16-27)*;

(ii)   providing a plurality of user interface document pages *(e.g., HTML documents)*

to a user *(e.g., the user)*, at least one of the user interface document pages having

at least a second link *(e.g., hypertext links) (col.3, lines 16-27)*; and

(iii)   indicating via at least one link property a display format for at least one of the first

and second links *(e.g., Link properties can be specified by users to control the*

automatic installation of link, and/or to control what is displayed while browsing

the link database; col.4, lines 9-20).

As to dependent claim 9:

Smith discloses using heuristics to automatically provide most-likely-to-use links to

additional material *(col.3, lines 1-18).*

As to dependent claim 10:

Smith discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon

documents previously navigated to by the user *(col.3, lines 22-27)*.

As to dependent claim 11:

Smith discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon

documents having subject matter similar to a document being viewed by the user *(col.17,*

lines 1-12).

As to dependent claim 12:

Smith discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon

documents created by an author who is the same as an author of a document being

viewed by the user *(e.g., links navigates to a page where a different context hierarchy*

can be selected ...can be designated by their creators ... the owner(s) can read; col.9,

lines 52-67).

As to dependent claim 13:

Smith discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon

documents created during a first time period substantially the same as a time period

during which a document being viewed by the user was created *(e.g., the first choice 101*

is a hyperlink ... functions involving groups of links; col. 5, lines 20-66).

As to dependent claim 14:

Smith discloses using heuristics to automatically provide a set of command choices the

user *(col.3, lines 21-27)*.

As to dependent claim 15:

Smith discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based

upon analysis of the user's current document context *(col.3, lines 1-27)*.

As to dependent claim 16:

Smith discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based

upon a set of commands recently invoked by the user *(col.3, lines 1-27)*.

As to dependent claim 17:

Smith discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based

upon commands the user has invoked most frequently in the past from contexts

substantially the same as the user's current document context *(e.g., the link by using the*

'back' button, or the 'history' list of visited pages maintained by the browser; col.3, lines

22-27).

As to dependent claim 18:

"reply, reply to all, forward, and delete" are inherent to the email program taught by

Smith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Smith, III** in

view of **Fraenkel et al.** (U.S. 6,151,622 – filed 02/1998).

As to dependent claim 6:

a.　　Fraenkel discloses displaying, in a display frame associated with a link in a

linked-from document page, information about a linked-to document *(col.3, lines*

48-63 and Fig.2).

b.　　It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include the feature from Fraenkel in the system of Smith

because it would have provided the capability for exchanging information from

one browser display and represent a replicated view of other browser displays.

As to dependent claim 7:

a.　　Fraenkel discloses displaying, in a display frame associated with a link in a

linked-from document page, content of a linked to document *(col.3, lines 48-*

col.4, line 11 and Fig.3).

b.　　It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include the feature from Fraenkel in the system of Smith

because it would have provided the capability for exchanging information from

one browser display and represent a replicated view of other browser displays.

As to dependent claim 8:

Smith discloses updating the display of the linked-to content at a rate specified by a

property of the link linking the linked-from and linked-to document pages *(col.10, lines*

39-48 /col.17, lines 59-62 & col.27, lines 33-42 and Figs. 5&7).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed on 06/25/200 have been fully considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Logan et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,761,683	issued: Jun. 2, 1998
Earl	U.S. Patent No. 5,924,104	issued: Jul. 13, 1999
Ma et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,788,316	issued: Sep. 7, 2004

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30

pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
May 23, 2005

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER